



UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Clerk of the Senate
427 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 625-9369

I

Salaries
leaves

Nov. 24, 1987

To: Phil Shively, Chr., Faculty Consultative Committee
From: Geoff Maruyama, Chr., Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
Re: Recommendations of the Faculty Development Committee on
(I) Faculty Salaries and (II) Sabbaticals and Leaves

I. Faculty Salaries

SCFA unanimously endorsed Recommendations 1-4.

Rationale:

We felt strongly that a new long-term salary plan is needed. Further, Commitment to Focus has directed attention to the fact that we compete for our faculty in the national marketplace and that salaries must be kept competitive with our peer institutions. At the same time, however, we noted that it may be difficult for persons unfamiliar with the University to believe that salaries are not competitive if those persons base their determinations on the figures we have been using to argue for restoration of purchasing power. In effect, the currently used figures confound aging of faculty with time; our faculty is markedly more senior than it was 15 years ago. A major step in unconfounding these two factors can be accomplished by looking within ranks at salaries (Recommendation 1). That approach maintains the logic of the current approach (thus, Recommendation 2) but uses a more accurate basis for comparison. (We noted that it is not an unmixed blessing which will necessarily get faculty larger salaries. The revised perspective likely would provide us with lower levels of faculty compensation when the "heavy" retirement years occur in the not too distant future).

Looking beyond the current policies, we agreed that development of additional salary principles depended upon the availability and accuracy of an ongoing data base (Recommendation 3). In particular, we likely rehashed most of the issues raised by the FDC, namely, are current data based only on Twin Cities Campus faculty or on the entire University of Minnesota system (with what implications?); are clinical faculty included; are only state salary components of professional/clinical faculty (e.g., Medical School) included, etc. At the end, it seemed most important to be able to know exactly what assumptions are made plus what the implications of the assumptions are.

Finally, we like the "Top 31" as a comparison group and would like to see future restoration of market competitiveness restored through Recommendation 4 or something else much like it. At the same time, however, with respect to Recommendation 4, we were unclear whether the "Top 10" was intended to be

Phil Shively

Page 2

dynamic or fixed, or if it was based upon undergraduate as well as graduate level programs.

II. Sabbaticals and Leaves

SCFA unanimously endorsed Recommendations 5-11 for immediate implementation. While favorably disposed toward Recommendations 12 and 13, we referred them to our Sabbaticals and Leaves Subcommittee for further study.

Rationale:

The FDC makes a very strong case for underutilization of sabbaticals. If one looks at sabbaticals as having value both for the institution and the individual, greater use of sabbaticals clearly should be encouraged. We saw the flexible sabbatical option (Recommendation 5), the availability of replacement funding where lack of funds prevents sabbaticals (Recommendation 6), and expanded and restructured "augmented" sabbaticals (Recommendations 8 and 10) each as cornerstones of increased sabbatical usage. Further, keeping the effective single quarter leave program (Recommendation 7) and formalizing faculty study projects (Recommendation 9), each are important parts of a flexible leave policy. Finally, we felt that prestigious awards should not carry with them hidden costs like loss of fringe benefits. With respect to this last point, a question was raised having to do with decentralization of fringe benefits. At present, Recommendation 11 is allowed; when implemented, fringe is paid retroactively on the income from the year(s) subsequent to the award when the faculty member is again receiving a University salary (i.e., fringe can't be given on no income). The question is: Can fringe be carried over from year to year to handle situations like those described by Recommendation 11?

Finally, you are getting a copy of a recommendation we sent to Vice President Benjamin to request compilation of a faculty handbook on academic policies and procedures. A discussion of such a handbook came up when we asked how faculty were supposed to know that the University might provide fringe for external awards. Such policies and procedures would be computer-accessible, downloadable, and would be regularly updated.

GM:mw

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
JUNE 1987

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

PART I. FACULTY SALARIES

Restoration of Purchasing Power

1. Progress toward the restoration of purchasing power by the fall of 1990 should be measured by reporting for each rank. If a single measure is necessary, it should be the simple average of experience of all ranks. (p. 1)
2. All official reports that include a calculation of the purchasing power of faculty salaries and compensation, such as the annual report of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, should use 1972-73 as a basis for comparison rather than a rolling base that changes each year. (p. 1)

Exchange of Salary Data

3. The University should work toward the goal of having data for all institution-wide salary exchanges prepared by the same office. The University should maintain a complete set of data definitions for each salary exchange. These definitions should be available in a single location and should include definitions for each year of the exchange. (p. 1)

Comparison Groups and New Salary Goals

4. A policy that continues to focus on purchasing power to the exclusion of our competitive position puts the quality of the University at risk. We recommend the goal of being at the average of the salaries for the top ten research institutions, as determined by quality ranking. Moreover, we recommend that we approach this goal by achieving annual salary increments of 2% above the average raise for these institutions. (p. 3)

PART II. FACULTY LEAVES AND STUDY PROJECTS

Flexible Sabbaticals

5. Set up a flexible sabbatical plan. A leave program which provides the maximum flexibility to colleges and departments to customize faculty leaves to their specific requirements is necessary. We recommend two new sabbatical options be added so that the following are available: one year at $\frac{1}{2}$ salary, two quarters at $\frac{3}{4}$ salary, one quarter at full salary. (p. 5)

Funding

6. We recommend that \$150,000 be budgeted in FY 88 to support the new sabbatical options. There are some units with tight staffing which make sabbatical options impossible without some financial help. (p. 6)

Single Quarter Leaves

7. Leave the Single Quarter Leave option as is. This is a successful competitive program, open to non-tenured as well as tenured faculty and we recommend that it be left in place. (p. 6)

Bush Sabbaticals

8. Retain, but reevaluate and restructure the Bush Sabbaticals. We recommend that the Bush guidelines be reexamined and clarified, and that the central process by which the Bush is awarded be reevaluated. Maintain the funding at 80% for a full year. (p. 6)

Faculty Study Projects

9. Endorse faculty study projects. We recognize and endorse the current system which allows units to make flexible arrangements with faculty members for short-term (one week to one quarter) projects. These arrangements need to be kept localized. The Provost should work with the Deans to establish any necessary University-wide guidelines for fairly administering these projects. (p. 7)

Merit Sabbaticals

10. Add 8-10 additional sabbaticals at 80% funding, for unrestricted proposals with merit. We recommend that the Provost provide \$150,000-175,000 in the FY 88 budget for these new sabbaticals. (p. 7)

Fringe Benefits

11. Provide fringe benefits and supplementary salary, if necessary, to winners of prestigious awards and competitions. A faculty members should not have to pay fringe benefits from an award, or suffer a salary loss in accepting it. (p. 7)

Summer Research Support

12. Provide additional summer research support for "B" appointments. We recommend that the FY 88 budget contain an additional \$100,000 for summer research support available through the Graduate School. The amount of summer research support has been eroding, and the number of awards has been decreasing. This situation should be remedied. (p. 7)

Development Professorships

13. Provide funding for Mid-Career Professorship to be used for the purpose of career development. (p. 7)

PART III. SUPPORT AND ASSISTANCE FOR FACULTY WORK

University Libraries

14. We recommend that the Provost take immediate action to reverse the decline in the quality of the University of Minnesota Libraries. (p. 8)
15. We recommend that faculty input to the Libraries be strengthened. (p. 9)

Computer Networking

16. We endorse, and urge implementation of the recommendations of the all University Committee for Network and Communications Planning. (Appendix III-A). (p. 10)

Grants Management

17. We recommend that \$200,000 be made available immediately to automate ORTTA in line with the recommendations of the study group, and further that \$30,000 per year be guaranteed for five years to cover service contracts on hardware and software. It should be further required that this activity be coordinated with the networking activity (#15 above) and with the move to automate purchasing and accounting (#20 below). (p. 10)

Faculty/Staff Ratios

18. We recommend that each unit be asked to identify the faculty/staff ratio which it considers necessary and practical for effective work. This ratio should be incorporated into planning goals, revised as needed, and consulted when any new hiring is proposed. (p. 10)

Training of Department Heads/Chairs

19. We recommend that the University prepare a Policies and Procedures Handbook for department heads to enable them to function efficiently in support of faculty and faculty initiatives. (p. 11)
20. We recommend that the Provost hold a periodic workshop to allow experienced and successful department heads/chairs to communicate what they have learned about (1) ways to manage civil service personnel policies and procedures; (2) counseling and support available for handling personnel problems encountered by faculty members; (3) effective deployment of financial resources; (4) counseling for career development and professional development of faculty members; and other similar areas of activity that support faculty work. (p. 11)

Purchasing and Accounting

21. We support completely the move to fully automate Purchasing and Accounting. However, it is essential that the move by ORTTA to automate go hand-in-hand so that there is not problem with compatibility. (p. 11)

Space Management

22. We support the recommendation of the Senate Research Committee that the Minnesota Facilities Model should be investigated in detail by faculty knowledgeable in model-building and alternatives that are acceptable to the faculty should be proposed if the MFM is found to be lacking. (p. 12)
23. We recommend that the Faculty Consultative Committee charge the Twin Cities members of the Senate Committee on Physical Plant and Space Allocation with the additional responsibility of reviewing facilities maintenance and urge them to submit a report. (p. 12)

Civil Service Policies and Faculty Programs

24. We recommend improved communication between the Senate Research Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee and representatives of the Civil Service personnel system who, are aware of impending changes in leaves and compensation policies. (p. 12)

Faculty Work Loads

25. We recommend that summary data be provided to all departments for teaching (and advising of undergraduate and graduate students, if possible) loads in major departments across the University. These data should be updated annually or biennially and trends in the data should be highlighted from time to time. (p. 13)

Faculty Appointments

26. We recommend that the University take the position that the nine month (academic year) appointment is the normal faculty appointment unless the twelve month appointment is justified on the basis of the duties and responsibilities assigned to that faculty position. This justification must be made before the position is advertised. Payment of salary over 12 months and/or augmentation of salary from research funds should not be precluded by this recommendation. (p. 13)
27. We recommend that each college review the types of faculty positions within that college and establish guidelines for identifying those that should be twelve month appointments. This review should in no way involve the nature of an appointment held by an incumbent faculty member, as the terms of employment for an incumbent can only be changed by mutual consent. (p. 14)